

170881243

PG 1 of 22

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE  
WESTERN DISTRICT OF OKLAHOMA

**FILED**

AUG 19 2021

Richard Glossip, et.al.,

PLAINTIFFS

CARMELITA REEDER SHINN, CLERK  
U.S. DIST. COURT, WESTERN DIST. OKLA.  
BY KAT DEPUTY

VS.

CASE NO. CW-14-665-F

Randy Chandler, et.al.,

DEFENDANTS/APPELLEES.

WADE LAY, PRO-SE PLAINTIFF/APPELLANT

PLAINTIFF WADE LAY ACTING PRO-SE NOTICE OF APPEAL  
WITH MOTION TO VACATE JUDGMENT TOWARDS  
WADE LAY (DOC. NO. 4 ) (WITH BRIEF IN SUPPORT)

COURT NOW WADE LAY PRO-SE WITH THIS NOTICE OF  
APPEAL AND MOTION TO VACATE JUDGMENT (DOC. NO. 4 ) AGAINST  
WADE LAY. LAY ACTS INDEPENDENT OF ALL OTHER PLAINTIFFS.

WADE GLOSSIP LAY # 516263  
OKLAHOMA STATE PENITENTIARY

DATE: 08/16/2021  
PRO-SE

P.O. BOX 99  
MCALISTER, OKLA. 74502

PC 2002

SEEING CLEARLY IN DOC. NO. 444 AT P. 1 OF THE  
COURT'S ORDER, IT STATES IN THE FIRST SENTENCE OF  
PARAGRAPH NO. 1, THE FOLLOWING:

" THE OPERATIVE STATEMENT OF THE CLAIM OF  
WADE LAY IN THIS ACTION IS THE THIRD AMEND-  
ED COMPLAINT, DOC. NO. 325, FILED ON JULY 7, 2020,  
WHICH EXPRESSLY INCLUDES MR. LAY AS A PL-  
AINTIFF. IN PARAGRAPH 114 OF THE THIRD AMEND-  
ED COMPLAINT, MR. LAY (ALONG WITH ALL OF  
THE OTHER PLAINTIFFS) PLEADS...

THE COURT GOES ON TO SUGGEST THAT THE CLAIMS MADE  
BY THE OTHER 31 ACTIVE PLAINTIFFS REPRESENTED BY  
CROWELL MORRIS AND THE FEDERAL PUBLIC DEFENDER  
IN OGC ARE UNDER SOME SORT OF JAWER OF PARTIES AND  
OR CLAIMS THAT ARE CONTINGENT ON THE DISPOSITION OF  
THE OTHER. WADE LAY MAKES IT VERY CLEAR THAT THIS

COURT OF THE UNITED STATES IS VIOLATING STATE LAW "

F.M.H

1) WADE LAY ALSO SUBMITS AN AMENDMENT TO DOC. NO. 448,  
FILED AUG. 09, 2021, PLEASE ACCEPT THE AMENDMENT, OR THIS NOTICE.

PR. 30722

THE RESERVED POWERS ACT OF OKLAHOMA 74 O.S. 2011,  
SECTION 18B, AS LAST AMENDED BY SECTION 1, CHAPTER  
444, O.S.L. 2019 (74 O.S. SUPP. 2020, SECTION 18B), WHICH  
RENDERS THE DISTRICT COURT OF SUBJECT MATTER JURISDICTION.

THIS IS A RECURRING PROBLEM WITH THE UNITED STATES  
DISTRICT COURT FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF OKLAHOMA  
(U.S.D.C. W.D./OK), WITH ITS TENDENCY TO MANIPULATE THE RULES  
AND LAWS AND PRECEDENT TO EFFECT WORK JUDICIALLY  
A PARTIES RIGHTS UNDER LAW. (SEE FOR EXAMPLE *Wade Lay*  
*v. Susan Otto, et. al.*, CW-12-888-D). THAT CASE *Lay v. Otto*  
WAS APPEALED TO THE TENTH CIRCUIT AND REMANDED. THIS  
ORDER AND JUDGMENT BEARS A SIMILAR INTRINSIC FRAUD.  
NOT ONLY HAS THIS COURT ALLOWED OKLAHOMA STATE FRAUD.

ROUTINARY (O.S.P.) TO DEPRIVE WADE LAY OF EVERY RIGHT  
NECESSARY TO LITIGATE THIS CASE, THE WARDEN AT O.S.P.  
ILLEGITIMATELY DEPRIVES THE PLAINTIFF LAY OF PERTINENT DOCUMENTS  
ESSENTIAL TO THE SUBJECT MATTER CONTAINED IN  
DOC. NO. 444 WITH ITS EXHIBIT A. (SEE DOC. NOS. 371 AND  
374). O.S.P. WARDEN MR. FAZILIS DELIBERATELY DEPRIVES  
WADE LAY OF SELECTIVE PLEADINGS FILED BY THE OTHER  
PLAINTIFF'S COUNSEL, AND THE ATTORNEY GENERAL. WADE LAY  
DID NOT EVEN HAVE A COPY OF THE OTHER 31 PLAINTIFF'S 3RD  
AMENDED COMPLAINT, LET ALONE UNDERSTAND ITS CONTENT.  
THIS ACTION BY THE COURT IS EQUIVALENT TO DISPOSING OF  
THE ACTION IN THE PLAINTIFF WADE LAY'S ABSENCE.  
IT IS NOW JUDICIAL TO SET A STANDARD WITHIN THE ORDER  
(DOC. NO. 444) SUCH AS:

PG. 5 of 22

" 100 PARAGRAPH 114 OF THE THIRD AMENDED COMPLAINT, MR. LAY (ALONG WITH ALL THE OTHER PLAINTIFFS) PLEADS THE EXISTENCE OF METHODS OF EXECUTION, AS ALTERNATIVES TO EXECUTION PER CHART D OF THE FEBRUARY, 2020 EXECUTION PROTOCOL (500 MILLIGRAMS OF MIDAZOLAM, FOLLOWED BY 100 MILLIGRAMS OF VECURONIUM BROMIDE, FOLLOWED BY 240 MILLIEQUIVALENTS OF POTASSIUM CHLORIDE), AS FOLLOWS:

" 114. SUBJECT TO THE FOREGOING, SOLELY FOR PURPOSES OF THIS PLEADING, [A PLEADING MADE LAY DID NOT POSSESS,] BASED ON STATUTORY AUTHORITY AND CURRENT AND HISTORICAL PRACTICES, AND UPON INFORMATION AND BELIEF, COUNSEL ALLEGES ON BEHALF OF PLAINTIFFS (EACH OF WHOM RESERVE THE RIGHT FOLLOWING CONSULTATION WITH COUNSEL TO OBJECT TO ANY PROFFERED ALTERNATIVE), THE FOLLOWING ALTERNATIVE METHODS OF EXECUTION ARE FEASIBLE, AVAILABLE, READILY IMPLEMENTED AND WOULD SIGNIFICANTLY REDUCE A SUBSTANTIAL RISK OF SEVERE PAIN."

IT IS WITHOUT ARGUMENT OR REFUTATION THAT MADE LAY HAD NO PART, KNOWLEDGE, OR UNDERSTANDING OF THIS ASSERTION IN ITS LEGAL CONCEPTION OR ABSTRACT QUALITY AS PERTAINING



128861243

PLA CORR2

TO MORAL OR RELIGIOUS CONVICTIONS. THE PLAINTIFF  
WADE LAY, ACTING PRO-SE, IS COMPLETELY VOID OF ANY  
INVOLVEMENT IN THIS CLAIM, YET THIS U.S. DIST. COURT  
HOLDS WADE LAY, FRAUDULENTLY, TO ITS RAMIFICATIONS  
AS IF IT IS A QUESTION OF LAW OR FACT COMMON TO  
HIS CLAIMS THAT ARE BY EXPRESS DELIBERATION TOTALLY  
SEPARATE FROM THE OTHER PLAINTIFFS. (SEE DOC NO.  
448, 12 PAGE PRO-SE PLEADING FILED AUGUST 9, 2021). ADDIT-  
IONALLY IT IS CRITICAL TO NOTE: TO WHOM OR WHAT COUNSEL  
DOES WADE LAY, ACTING PRO-SE HAVE TO CONSULT WITH, AND  
SEEING THAT LAY WAS WITHOUT THE DOCUMENT NO. 325,  
THE PLAINTIFF WADE LAY HAS BEEN PLACED IN A POSITION  
OF AN INTERPLEADER, WHERE THE CLAIMS OF THE OTHER  
PLAINTIFFS HAVE BEEN UTILIZED TO HAVE AN ADVERSE

EFFECT ON WADE LAY.

IN FACT, THE DISTRICT COURT HAS EVEN APPLIED  
THESE CLAIMS TO WADE LAY IN DIRECT CONTRADICTION

TO ITS OWN RECITATIONS, I.E., *Bucklew V. Precythe*, 139

S.Ct. 1112 (2019). THE W.D. COURT U.S. DIST. JUDGE

FRIOT COMPLETELY REST HIS JUDGMENT UPON RULE

54(b) CERTIFICATION AS TO SIX PLAINTIFFS, (WADE LAY

BEING, ERRONEOUSLY INCLUDED AS ONE OF THE SIX (6)).

THE COURT STATES:

"HAVING MADE THE NECESSARY DETERMINATIONS, THE  
COURT CONCLUDES AND CERTIFIES THAT FINAL JUDGMENT  
SHOULD BE ENTERED UNDER RULE 54(b) AGAINST  
THE SIX PLAINTIFFS WHO HAVE NOT PROFFERED AN AL-  
TERNATIVE METHOD FOR CARRYING OUT THEIR SEN-  
TENCE OF DEATH. THESE SIX PLAINTIFFS ARE CODDIN-  
GTON, D. GRANT, J. GRANT, JONES, LAY AND POSTELLE."

THE FACT OF THE MATTER IS, THIS COURT'S PROPOSED

PL. BOFF

DETERMINATIONS, AS A MATTER OF LAW, DOES NOT APPLY

TO WADE LAY, IT IS A MISTAKE, AN OVERTSIGHT,

AN EXCUSABLE NEGLECT, OR INADVERTANCE, AS STATED

IN FED. R. CIV. P. 60(b)(1). IN FACT, WADE LAY PRESENTS

ARGUMENTS THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED

STATES CONFIRMS. THE COURT IN *BUCKLEW* DECLARES:

"STILL, ACCEPTING THE POSSIBILITY THAT A STATE MIGHT TRY TO CARRY OUT AN EXECUTION IN AN INDEMNIFIABLE CRUEL AND UNUSUAL MANNER, HOW CAN A COURT DETERMINE WHEN A STATE HAS CROSSED THE LINE? THE CHIEF JUSTICE'S OPINION IN *BAZE*, WHICH A MAJORITY OF THE COURT HELD TO BE CONTROLLING, IN *GLOSSIP*, SUPPLIES CRITICAL GUIDANCE. IT TEACHES THAT WHERE (AS HERE) THE QUESTION IN DISPUTE IS WHETHER THE STATE'S CHOSEN METHOD OF EXECUTION CRUELLY SUPERADDS PAIN TO THE DEATH SENTENCE, A PRISONER MUST SHOW A FEASIBLE AND READILY IMPLEMENTED ALTERNATIVE METHOD OF EXECUTION THAT WOULD SIGNIFICANTLY REDUCE A SUBSTANTIAL RISK OF PAIN AND THAT THE STATE HAS REFUSED TO ADOPT WITHOUT A LEGITIMATE PENOLOGICAL REASON. See *Glossip*, 576 U.S. at —, 135 S. CT, 2132-2138, *Baze*, 553 U.S. at 62, 125 S. CT. 1020. *Glossip* LEFT NO DOUBT THAT THIS STANDARD GOVERNS 'ALL EIGHTH AMENDMENT



pg. 9 of 22

"METHOD OF EXECUTION CLAIMS" 576 U.S. AT —, 135 S.Ct. 2781."

ONE SIGNIFICANT POINT, AS A MATTER OF LAW, CLEARLY  
STICKS OUT TO ANY RATIONAL OBSERVER. TO WHOM OR WHAT  
ENTITY IS THE SUP. CT. REFERRING TO WHEN IT STATES:

"A PRISONER MUST SHOW A FEASIBLE AND READILY IMPLEMENTED  
ALTERNATIVE METHOD OF EXECUTION", IF IT IS NOT THE  
FEDERAL COURTS, OR IN THIS CASE THE U.S.D.C. W.D./OK.,  
THEREFORE, CONTAINED WITHIN EVERY SINGLE PLEADING,  
MOTION, AMENDED COMPLAINT, TO INCLUDE THE PLAINTIFF  
WADE LAY'S RESPONSE (DOC. NO. 448) TO THIS COURT'S  
MISAPPLIED CONJUNCTION OR JOINDER OF CLAIMS IN DOC. NO.  
444, WITH ITS EXHIBIT - A, THE COURT MUST RECOGNIZE  
ITS OVERSIGHTS AND OMISSIONS.

IT IS PLAINLY STATED BY LAY IN EVERY PLEADING, PRES-

128881243

12, 100622

ENTERED IN THIS CASE, TO INCLUDE DOC. NO. 44B, THAT, THIS  
U.S. COURT, AND THE COURTS OF THE UNITED STATES,  
LED BY THE SUPREME COURT, IS OUTSIDE OF ITS CONSTITUTIONAL  
BOUNDARIES, USURPING THEIR POWERS BEYOND  
THE LIMITS OF ITS ARTICLE III JURISDICTION. FOR THAT  
REASON, IT IS IMPOSSIBLE FOR LAY TO BE CONSIDERED  
AS ONE OF THE FIVE (5), OR, TWENTY SIX (26) PLAINTIFFS  
WHOM WERE REPRESENTED BY COUNSEL AND "PLEADS THE  
EXISTENCE OF METHODS OF EXECUTION AS ALTERNATIVES".  
RATHER, THE POINT THAT IS MADE BY THE SUPREME COURT,  
EVEN WITHIN ITS USURPED DISPOSITION, LIES WITHIN THE EXCEPTION  
IS CONTROLLING HERE,  
RECOGNIZED BY THE COURT<sup>10</sup> "Glossip", THE SUP. CT. STATES:  
"THE EIGHTH AMENDMENT DOES NOT COME INTO PLAY UNLESS  
THE RISK OF PAIN ASSOCIATED WITH THE STATE'S METHOD  
IS 'SUBSTANTIAL WHEN COMPARED TO A KNOWN AND AVAIL-  
ABLE ALTERNATIVE.' GLOSSIP, ... 135 S. CT. 2738".

SO IT IS OBVIOUS THAT THE PRISONER PROVIDING AN ALTERNATIVE, MUST HAVE A COGNITIVE AWARENESS OF THE FEASIBILITY, AND THE AVAILABILITY AS IT PERTAINS TO THE STATE. ADDITIONALLY, HE MUST HAVE AN UNDERSTANDING OF THE MITIGATING QUALITIES THAT THE ALTERNATE METHOD OF EXECUTION CONTAINS. THEREFORE, THE SUBTERFUGE INVOLVED IN THIS INSTANT CASE, I.E., SURROUNDING THE SCHEME WHICH HAS BEEN DEVISED TO ENTRAP WADE LAY AT THIS LATE HOUR WITH DOC. NO. 444, WITH THE ASSISTANCE OF SARAH JERNIGAN, DOES NOT FIT THE CRITERION SET BY THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES IN *Bucklew V. Precythe*.

ON PAGES 5-8 OF DOCUMENT NO. 449, THE U.D. COURT'S ORDER AND JUDGMENT, I.E., THE RELEVANCE AND RAMIFICATIONS OF THE "TWO-PHASE TEST", WADE LAY'S ABILITY

120481243

Pg. 12 of 22

TO GRASP THE ESSENCE OF THE MATTER IS SKEWED BY  
A DELIBERATE DEFLECT OF THE DISTRICT COURT, AND  
A DELIBERATE AND DECEITFUL ACT EXERCISED BY SARAH  
JERNIGAN (FEDERAL PUBLIC DEFENDER, O.K., (SUSAN OTTO-  
DIRECTOR)).

FIRST, WADE LAY HAS BEEN DEPRIVED OF THE NECESSARY  
DOCUMENTS THAT CONSTITUTE A REASONABLE STATE OF  
COMPLIANCE, OR THE ABILITY TO FULFILL THE OBLIGATIONS  
WHICH ESTABLISHES A NECESSARY COMPETENCE OF THE  
DISTRICT COURT'S DEMANDS IN DOC NO. 444, WITH ITS  
EXHIBIT - A.<sup>2</sup>

SECOND, THE W.D. COURT EMPLOYS ONE OF ITS LOYAL  
OFFICERS - MISS SARAH JERNIGAN TO MISGUIDE WADE LAY

F.B.I.

2) IT IS CLEAR, A FACT THAT IS PART OF THE RECORD, THAT IN DEC.  
OF 2020 THE NEW WARDEN (FARRIS) TOLD LEGAL MAIL NOT TO PROVIDE  
LEGAL DOCUMENTS TO LAY IN THIS CASE, (SEE DOC NO. 374). THE  
FACTS ARE ON JULY 28, 2020 THE W.D. COURT ORDERED ALL DOCUMENTS

PG. 13/22

INTO A FATAL DECISION THAT IS PREDICATED ON ERRONEOUS INFORMATION DESIGNED TO ACCOMMODATE THE COURT'S ENTRAPMENT.

IN MAY, ON OR ABOUT THE 3<sup>RD</sup> OR 4<sup>TH</sup> OF MAY 2021, THE ATTORNEYS FOR THE OTHER THIRTY ONE (31) PLAINTIFFS, CAME TO O.S.P. TO MEET WITH THE OTHER PLAINTIFFS. (AS IT IS RECORDED SO MANY TIMES IN MULTIPLE DOCUMENTS "OTHER THAN WADE LAY", (SEE EG, DKT. NOS. 342 AND 425) WADE LAY WAS NOT PRESENT TO THIS MEETING WHERE ALL THE OTHER PLAINTIFFS WERE ALERTED TO THE ACTUAL RAMIFICATIONS OF THE CIRCUMSTANCES AND CONSEQUENCES OF THE W.D. COURT'S ORDER AND COMPUSSION OF EXHIBIT -A, ATTACHED TO DOC. NO. 444).

<sup>F.D.#</sup>  
2) TO BE PROVIDED TO WADE LAY. HOWEVER, THE ORDER (DOC. NO. 374) IN RESPONSE TO THE WARDEN'S DEPRIVATION IS WEAK. THE COURT SIMPLY SENDS THREE (3) COPIES OF THE ORDER (DOC. NO. 374) TO WADE LAY: "TO SHOW TO INSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITIES, SHOULD THE NEED ARISE." THE COURT GIVES NO DIRECT ORDER TO THE PRISON. O.S.P. HAS WITHHELD THE SIGNIFICANT AND CRUCIAL DOCUMENTS, SUCH AS THE 3<sup>RD</sup> AMENDED COMPLAINT, AND 426.

128881243

Pg. 14 of 22

IT IS DISPLAYED IN DOC. NO. 444 AT PG. 1, PAR. 2, INSERTED  
BY U.S. DIST. JUDGE FRIOT THE PLAINTIFFS "RESERVE THE  
RIGHT FOLLOWING CONSULTATION WITH COUNSEL TO OBJECT  
TO ANY PROFFERED ALTERNATIVE". YET, JUDGE FRIOT  
KNEW QUITE WELL, THAT WADE LAY IS NOT REPRESENTED  
BY COUNSEL IN THIS CASE. HE ALSO KNEW THAT WADE  
LAY, ON MAY 08, 2021, LITERALLY THE SAME WEEK OF THE  
MEETINGS WITH ALL THE OTHER PLAINTIFFS WITH COUNSEL (DALE  
A. BAICH, AND JENNIFER M. MORENO - FEDERAL PUBLIC  
DEFENDER), THAT WADE LAY WAS WRITE UP ON BOKUS  
MISCONDUCT CHARGES THAT RESULTED IN HIM BEING SEPER-  
ATED FROM HIS FAMILY<sup>S</sup>.

THEREFORE, LAY BEING UNABLE TO COMMUNICATE WITH  
HIS FAMILY IN LATE JULY, WHEN HE SUDDENLY RECEIVES

F.R.V.

3) SEE Wade Lay V. A.C.L.U. et al., CIV-21-605-J, DOC. NO. 1.



PL 150722

THE DOCUMENT NO. 444, WITH ITS EXHIBIT-A, JUDGE  
ERLOT KNEW LAY'S ONLY CONTACT WAS SARAH JERNIGIAN  
(FEDERAL PUBLIC DEFENDER), A SERVANT OF THE COURT  
WHO KNEW ABOUT THE MAY 3<sup>RD</sup> MEETING WITH ALL  
THE OTHER PLAINTIFFS, WHERE THOSE PLAINTIFFS  
(SOME OF WHICH ARE SARAH JERNIGIAN'S CLIENTS) WERE  
WARNED, THAT, IF THEY DID NOT PROVIDE AN ALTERNAT-  
TIVE TO THE METHOD OF EXECUTION THEY WOULD  
LIKELY FACE EXECUTION; MISS JERNIGIAN ON  
JULY , 2021 ADVISED WADE LAY, IMPROMPTU - WITHOUT  
LAY EVEN ASKING (SEE EXHIBIT 1243 - ), WITH ADVICE  
TO DECLINE TO PROVIDE AN ALTERNATIVE .

IT IS OBVIOUS, THIS IS WHY O.S.P. FABRICATES THE  
BOGUS MISCONDUCT CHARGES, IN THE SAME VEIN AS

PG. 16 OF 22

WHEN O.S.P. SENDS TRUST FUND DOLLARS TO THE U.S.D.C.

W.D. /OK. (SEE DEC. NO. 66 OF *Lay V. O.D.O.C.*, CN-17-1224-J),

THE PRISON ACCOMMODATES THE W.D. COURT AND

THE F.P.D., AS EXHIBITED IN *Lay V. O.D.O.C.*, CN-17-

1224-J; NO. 18-6024, *Lay's* MOTION FOR INJUNCTIVE RELIEF

FILED AUGUST 22, 2018 TO THE 10<sup>TH</sup> CIRCUIT, WHERE IT IS

OBVIOUS O.S.P. TRUST FUND OFFICER NANCY JOYCE FILLS

OUT THE IN-FORMA-PROUDERIS FOR THE F.P.D. PATTICHERI

TO AID IN THE ILLICIT FILING OF WADE LAY'S FEDERAL

HABEAS PETITION.

NOW THE W.D. COURT UTILIZES THESE BUREAUCRATIC

OFFICERS (STATE AND FEDERAL) TO KILL THE POLITICAL

INSURGENT BECAUSE OF HIS CONSTITUTIONAL OPINIONS, AND

THE FACT WADE LAY HAS CONTINUED TO ATTEMPT TO HOLD

THOSE BUREAUCRATIC OFFICERS ACCOUNTABLE FOR THEIR  
CRIMES VIOLATING THE RESERVED POWERS ACT OF  
OKLAHOMA (74 O.S. 2011, SECTION 18b, AS LAST AMENDED  
BY SECTION 1, CHAPTER 444, O.S.L. 2019 (74 O.S. SUPP. 2020,  
SECTION 18b).

THIS OFFENSE BY BUREAUCRATIC OFFICERS (STATE AND  
FEDERAL) IS DESCRIBED BY WADE LAY TO THE W.D.

COURT IN DOC. NO. 448, LAY'S RESPONSE TO DOC. NO.

444, WITH ITS EXHIBIT-A, WHERE THE W.D. COURT

PRESSES LAY TO PROVIDE AN ANSWER FOR ISSUES

HE WAS PURPOSELY LEFT IN THE DARK ABOUT BY THE

W.D. COURT'S LOYAL BUREAUCRATIC SERVENTS.

THESE ACTIONS BY THE W.D. COURT, O.S.P., THE F.P.D.

AND POSSIBLY THE ATTORNEYS REPRESENTING THE THIRTY ONE

(31) OTHER PLAINTIFFS IS VERY SIMILAR TO THE METHODS EMPLOYED BY RUSSIA AND CHINA TO TERMINATE THEIR POLITICAL ADVERSARIES, AND IS A DIRECT VIOLATION OF THE TENTH ARTICLE OF AMENDMENT.

AND FORBID THAT JUDGES USE THEIR POWERS TO SUPPRESS THE TRUTH. THE W.D. COURT IN DOC. NO. 449, JUDGE PRIOT'S ORDER WITH HIS SUBSEQUENT JUDGMENT DOES JUST THAT, ON PG. , OF DOC. NO. 449 JUDGE PRIOT CLAIMS WADE LAY EMPHATICALLY REFUSES TO PROVIDE AN ALTERNATIVE TO EXECUTION AS EXPLAINED BY THE U.S. SUP. CT. IN *BULLOCK*, BUT THE TRUTH IS THAT LAY STATES EMPHATICALLY AND CLEARLY THAT, THE U.S.D.C. W.D. /OK DOES NOT POSSESS JURISDICTION TO DEMAND SUCH AN INTERACTION BETWEEN THE GOVERNING

OFFICIALS IN THE STATE OF OKLAHOMA AND THE  
CITIZENS OR INHABITANTS IN THEIR CUSTODY,  
WITH THE EXCEPTION OF FOREIGN CITIZENS OR SUBJECTS.

THE PLAINTIFF WADE LAY CONSISTENTLY, IN EVERY  
PLEADING, MOTION, AMENDED COMPLAINT (DOC. NO. 326),  
AND LAY'S RESPONSE (DOC. NO. 448) TO DOC. NO. 444,

WITH ITS EXHIBIT - A, THAT, THE COURTS OF THE UNITED  
STATES ARE OUTSIDE OF THEIR CONSTITUTIONAL ARTICLE  
III ENUMERATED POWERS WITH SUCH ENCRoACHMENT  
AS THAT ARTICULATED IN DOC. NO. 444.

U.S. DIST. JUDGE FRIOT, AND THE ACTIONS OF THE U.S.  
COURT IN *Lay v. O.D.O.*, CIV-17-1224-J; AND *Lay v. A.C.H.O.*, CIV-  
21-605-J, CONFIRM WADE LAY'S CLAIMS WITH JUDGE  
FRIOT'S INCORPORATION OF WADE LAY INTO THE 3RD AMENDED

120001243

Pg. 20 of 22

COMPLAINT FOR THE PURPOSE OF HOLDING LAY TO

THE TWO PRONG TEST OF CLAIM 11, WHICH LAY HAD NO

KNOWLEDGE OF DUE TO DEPRIVATIONS ORDERED BY THE

WARDEN FARRIS, TO HIS SUBORDINATES AT O.S.P., ABUSES

WADE LAY MOTIONED THE W.D. COURT DOZENS OF TIMES

TO ADDRESS AND PUT AN END TO SO LAY COULD PARTICIPATE

IN THE CIVIL ACTION *Glossip v. Chandler, et al.*, THE VERY

CASE JUDGE FRIOT USED TO NOW KILL WADE LAY,

THE W.D. COURT'S ORDER DOC. NO. 449, AND ITS

JUDGMENT DOC. NO. 4 TOWARDS WADE LAY, INCLUDING

THESE PLAINTIFFS

LAY AS ONE OF THE OTHER PLAINTIFFS, WHO HAD THE

KNOWLEDGE WITH THE ASSISTANCE OF COUNSEL ACTING

FOR THEIR BEST INTEREST WITHIN THAT SPHERE OF

COGNITIVE AWARENESS, WHERE MR. CODDINGTON, D. GILANT,



J. GRANT, JONES, AND PORCELL KNEW THE LEGAL

RAMIFICATIONS OF THEIR CHOICE; THOSE FIVE (5)

HOT BEING MISLED BY THE FEDERAL PUBLIC DEFENDER

SARAH JEROMEAN (SEE EXHIBIT 1248- ), IS SEPERATE

ALTOGETHER FROM THE TRUE POSITION WEADE LAY

IS IN.

WEADE LAY IS A PRO-SE PLAINTIFF SUFFERING EXTREME

ABUSE AND DEPRIVATIONS FROM THE CORRECTIONAL

FACILITY, AND THE DISTRICT COURT WAS FULLY AWARE

OF THOSE ABUSES AND DEPRIVATIONS, FOR THAT REASON

WEADE LAY MOTIONS THE TENTH CIRCUIT COURT ON

APPEAL TO IMMEDIATELY VACATE THE JUDGMENT,

AND ORDER THE COURT TO CONSIDER AND EXPEDITIOUSLY

HEARING WITH DISCOVERY TO ASCERTAIN THE TRUE NATURE

128881243

PL. 22022

BF WADE LAYS RESPONSE TO DOC. NO. 444 AND  
ITS EXHIBIT A.

THE US. SUP. CT. IN BUCKLEW DOES NOT INTEND  
TO ALLOW FOR A DECEITFUL SUCKER PUNCH TO  
DEATH ROW PRISONERS, BY DECEITFUL BUREAUCRATIC  
OFFICERS AND UNETHICAL LAWYERS.

THIS NOTICE OF APPEAL WITH ITS MOTION TO  
VACATE THE JUDGMENT IS RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED  
\*  
THIS 16<sup>TH</sup> DAY OF AUGUST, 2021.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED

BY BUREAU LAY, AT OS.

P.O. BOX 97

MCALISTER, OKLA. 74502

F.D.

\* SEE ALSO AMENDED PLEADING OF DOC. NO. 448 ENCLOSED!